REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request that the above-identified application be reexamined.

Claims 1-10, 21-30, and 40-41 are pending in this application. Claims 11-20 and 31-39 have been withdrawn from consideration and canceled without prejudice, and Claims 40-41 have been added. The Office Action mailed July 17, 2008 (hereinafter "Office Action"), rejected Claims 1, 5-9, 21, and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0103190, issued to Kunihiko Mochizuki (hereinafter "Mochizuki"), taken in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0064568, issued to Akhil K. Arora (hereinafter "Arora"), taken further in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 7,127,641, issued to Doug Anderson (hereinafter "Anderson"). Claims 2-4 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of the teachings of Mochizuki, Arora, and Anderson as applied to Claims 1 and 21, taken in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0090531 to Wong et al. (hereinafter "Wong"). Claims 10 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of the teachings of Mochizuki, Arora, and Anderson as applied to Claims 1 and 21 above, taken further in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0031030 to Kidder et al. (hereinafter "Kidder"). While applicants disagree with these rejections, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, independent Claims 1 and 21 have been amended.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and for the reasons set forth below, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. Prior to discussing in detail why applicants believe that all the claims in this application are allowable, a brief description of the disclosed subject matter and a brief description of the teachings of the cited and applied references are provided. The following descriptions of the disclosed subject matter and the cited and applied references are not provided to define the scope or interpretation of any of the claims

of this application. Instead, these descriptions are provided solely to assist the United States Patent and Trademark Office in recognizing the differences between the pending claims and the cited references, and should not be construed as limiting on the disclosed subject matter.

Summary of the Disclosed Subject Matter

A computer-implemented method for collecting information about the programs installed on a computer and the services provided by the computer, and storing the information in log files in a standardized manner, is disclosed. In one exemplary embodiment, three types of information are collected. The first type is system information including, but not limited to, information about the computer operating system, hardware, and processor. The second type is information about the executables, i.e., executable programs used by the operating system, including, but not limited to, information about executables included in a defined set of folders stored on the computer and executables associated with services provided by the computer. The executables information includes attributes determined by the executables. Each executable includes a plurality of associated attributes. The attributes include at least one attribute, other than a version number, in the standardized language. The third type is application information about the application programs installed on the computer including linked executables. The application program information includes attributes determined by the application programs including the linked executables. The collected information is stored in a log file in the standardized language. Further, a signature for each executable is also stored in the log file in a standardized language. The signature is based on more than one of the plurality of attributes associated with the related executable. Each individual executable consists of multiple attributes. Summary of Mochizuki (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0103190)

Mochizuki is directed toward a system and method for recognizing configurations. See Mochizuki, Paragraph [0006]. Mochizuki purportedly carries out user support by recognizing a

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN COONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS***
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
20.662.8100

configuration of software and/or hardware of a user's computer system. However, Mochizuki fails to teach or suggest a system in which multiple attributes are utilized to form a signature.

Summary of Arora (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0064568)

Arora is directed to a distributed index mechanism for indexing and searching for

presence information in peer-to-peer networks. (Arora, Abstract.) A notification service may be

implemented on top of the distributed index to notify peers of other peers joining a peer-to-peer

session. Participating peers may query the distributed index to detect the presence of other

participating peers registered in the distributed index. Like Mochizuki, Arora fails to teach or

suggest a system in which multiple attributes are utilized to form a signature.

Summary of Anderson (U.S. Patent No. 7,127,641)

Anderson is directed to a system and method for using Extensible Markup Language

(XML) as a scripting language for testing of software programs. (Anderson, Abstract.)

Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) is used to define a new markup language for developing

scripts that can be used by a test control processor to test other software programs. The test

control processor may include an XML processor for processing the script. The test control

processor submits instructions to software programs under test and extracts the behavior of the

software program. (Anderson, Col. 1, line 65, to Col. 2, line 11.) Like Mochizuki and Arora,

Anderson fails to teach or suggest a system in which multiple attributes are utilized to form a

signature.

Summary of Wong et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0090531)

Wong et al. purportedly discloses a digital preservation system for accepting a digital

data record as input. The digital data record is written in human-readable form onto a

preservation quality medium. The digital preservation system preserves the data record in a human-readable form, along with an associated metadata record. Preserving the data record in a

human-readable form allows the preserved data record to be readable independent of specific

LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESSILLE 1420 Fifth Avenue Suite 2800 Seattle, Washington 98101 206.682.8100

reading hardware. Hence, the preserved data record may be readable in the distant future. Like Mochizuki, Arora, and Anderson, Wong fails to teach or suggest a system in which multiple attributes are utilized to form a signature.

Summary of Kidder et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0031030)

Kidder et al. purportedly discloses a method and apparatus for facilitating hot upgrades of software components within a telecommunications network device through the use of signatures generated by a signature-generating program. After installation of a new software release within the network device, only those software components whose signatures do not match the signatures of corresponding and currently executing software components are upgraded. The signatures provide a way to accurately determine the upgrade status of each software component. Like Mochizuki, Arora, Anderson, and Wong, Kidder fails to teach or suggest a system in which multiple attributes are utilized to form a signature.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1, 5-9, 21, and 25-29

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mochizuki, Arora, and Anderson. Claim 1, as amended, reads as follows:

- A computer-implemented method of collecting and storing information about the programs installed on and the services provided by a computer for subsequent retrieval, comprising:
- (a) extracting from the computer information including, but not limited to, information about the computer operating system, hardware, and processor and storing the system information in a log file in a standardized language;
- (b) extracting from the computer executables information including, but not limited to, information about executables included in a defined set of folders stored on the computer and executables associated with services provided by the computer:
- (c) for each executable whose information is extracted, determining if the executable is associated with the operating system, and if it is determined that the executable is not associated with the operating system, storing information about the executable in the log

file, the stored executable information including attributes determined by the executables, each executable including a plurality of associated attributes, the attributes including at least one attribute, other than a version number, in the standardized language;

- (d) extracting from the computer information regarding the application programs installed on the computer including linked executables and storing the application program information in the log file in a standardized language, the application program information including attributes determined by the application programs including the linked executables: and
- (e) deriving a signature for each of the executables, the signature being based on more than one of the plurality of attributes associated with the related executable and storing the resultant signatures in the log file in the standardized language.

(Emphasis added.)

Applicants submit that neither Mochizuki, Arora, nor Anderson, alone or combined, disclose every recitation of Claim 1. In particular, the cited references fail to disclose the recitation "for each executable whose information is extracted, determining if the executable is associated with the operating system, and if it is determined that the executable is not associated with the operating system, storing information about the executable in the log file." Mochizuki is purportedly directed toward a system and method for recognizing system configurations. The system of Mochizuki purportedly extracts information about a configuration of software and/or hardware of a user's PC. See, Mochizuki, Paragraph 0035. However, Mochizuki does not specifically mention executables or determining if an executable is associated with the operating system as recited in amended Claim 1. Further, Mochizuki does not teach storing information about an executable in a log file if the executable is not associated with the operating system. The additional cited references, Arora and Anderson, fail to overcome the deficiencies of Mochizuki. As a result, even if the teachings of Mochizuki, Arora, and Anderson were combinable, which applicants deny, the resulting combination would not contain all the limitations of Claim 1.

"When evaluating claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, all the limitations of the claims must be considered and given weight." See Exparte Grasselli, 231 U.S.P.Q. 393 (Bd. App. 1983), aff'd mem. 738 F.2d 453 (Fed. Cir. 1984). (Emphasis added.) See also M.P.E.P. § 2143.01(II). In addition, it is well established that a prima facie case of obviousness is only shown if the cited references, alone or in combination, teach each and every element recited in the claim. In re Bell, 991 F.2d 781 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Mochizuki, Arora, and Anderson, alone or in combination, fail to disclose the elements of Claim 1. For the above reasons, applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 is patentable over Mochizuki, Arora, and Anderson, taken alone or in combination and request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on the teachings of these three references.

Dependent Claims 5-9

Claims 5-9 depend from Claim 1 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections with regard to Claims 5-9 and allowance of the claims.

Independent Claim 21

Independent Claim 21 recites:

- 21. A computer-implemented method of collecting and storing information about the applications installed on and the services provided by a computer for subsequent retrieval, comprising:
 - (a) extracting from the computer executables information:
- (b) for each executable, determining if the executable is associated with a computer operating system; and
- (c) for each executable not associated with the operating system:
- (i) enumerating each executable associated with each application of a plurality of applications installed on the computer and each service of a plurality of services provided by the computer that has an associated executable;
- (ii) extracting information about the executable, the information including a plurality of attributes associated with the executable, the attributes including at least one attribute other than a

version number, and storing the information in a log file in a standardized language; and

(iii) deriving a signature from a combined set of attributes, the combined set of attributes including at least two of the attributes associated with the related executable and storing the signature in the log file in a standardized language.

(Emphasis added)

Claim 21 recites a method for collecting and storing information about applications installed on and the services provided by a computer for subsequent retrieval. As discussed above with regard to Claim 1, the cited references fail to disclose "for each executable, determining if the executable is associated with a computer operating system" and "for each executable not associated with the operating system," as recited in Claim 21. In addition, the cited references fail to disclose "enumerating each executable associated with each application of a plurality of applications installed on the computer and each service of a plurality of services provided by the computer that has an associated executable." Careful review of the cited references fails to reveal any mention of "enumerating each executable." Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 21 also be withdrawn and the claim be allowed.

Dependent Claims 25-29

Claims 25-29 depend from Claim 21 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to Claim 21. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections with regard to Claims 25-29 and allowance of the claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 2-4 and 22-24

Claims 2-4 and Claims 22-24 depend from amended Claims 1 and 21, respectively, and, since Wong does not make up for the deficiencies of Mochizuki, Arora, and Anderson, these claims are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to

Claims 1 and 21. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections with regard to Claims 2-4 and 22-24 and allowance of the claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 10 and 30

Claims 10 and 30 depend from amended Claims 1 and 21, respectively, and, since Kidder does not make up for the deficiencies of Mochizuki, Arora, and Anderson, these claims are submitted to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended Claims 1 and 21. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections with regard to Claims 10 and 30 and allowance of the claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully submit that all of the remaining claims in this application are allowable. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing this application to issue is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' attorney at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESSPILE

Clint J. Feekes

Registration No. 51,670 Direct Dial No. 206.695.1633

GSK/CJF:jlg